

spinning on Medicare. Well, you do not have to spin at all to simply open the budget proposals and find out who gets what. The budget proposals are simple. The budget plan provides for a very significant tax cut, going largely to the most affluent Americans, and it provides for by far the largest cut in Medicare expenditures in the history of this program.

We have had speakers say the cuts in Medicare are simply a cut in the rate of growth. If you have more and more seniors becoming eligible for Medicare, then the size of the program increases. If health care—not only for Medicare recipients but for all Americans—increases in price every year, and it does, then that increases the cost of the program.

Now, if you have those two facts—more elderly being covered by Medicare and higher health care prices—and you say we are not going to pay, we are going to cut way back, what that means is that those senior citizens who rely on Medicare will pay higher prices and get less care. I do not think there is any question about that.

They talk about experts. Most of the experts look at the numbers and say, "Yes, it is true we will spend more on Medicare, but we will still not meet the needs of older Americans because there is a graying of America" and because health care costs are going to continue to increase.

The fact is that what the Federal Government will spend is not going to meet the needs and the result will be that the elderly will receive less health care and pay more for it. That is just a fact.

Now, my own view of Medicare is, I suppose, fashioned at least in part by where I grew up. I grew up in a town of 300 people. There are a lot of elderly folks in my hometown. I saw a lot of folks when I was a teenager who reached the end of their lives and did not have anything—no money, no assets—who worried, who lived in desperate fear that they would get ill and would not have the ability to afford health care.

I saw that, as did most other people. It is nice to know that today, at least, most of those people do not live in that kind of fear because Medicare helps them. Medicare helps provide for them.

I had a woman in my home county, whom I told the Senate about some while ago, who showed up at a town meeting, stood up and said, "I have new knees, a new hip, and I had cataract surgery. I am 75 years old and feel like a million bucks." What a remarkable thing. Fifty years ago she would not have had new knees and a new hip, and she would have been in a wheelchair. If she came to the meeting, she would not have been able to see me.

With the breathtaking achievements in medical care, plus the program called Medicare, this woman has a good life. At age 75, she tells us she feels like a million dollars.

I am enormously proud of what we have done. I think what is important

as we talk about reform these days is that we not start to take apart the things that make this country good. I am perfectly willing to sit down with anybody in this Chamber and say, "All right, we will decide to work on this particular issue. We will make sure that Medicare is solvent for the long term."

We have done that before. We will always do that. We will always make adjustments to make Medicare financially sound. Mr. President, 23 of 25 trustees' reports in the last 25 years have described a date by which insolvency would occur, and we made adjustments and stretched that out.

I am willing to do that. But I am unwilling, under any conditions, to join hands with those who say, "Let's make room for a big tax cut." Yes, we are up to our neck in debt. We want to build Star Wars. Yes, we want to go out and buy blimps, but then make room for a big tax cut. How do we pay for that?

There is an easy way: Take it out of Medicare and Medicaid over here and invent something that you want to foist upon the American people as new—a trustees' report that says Medicare will be insolvent.

If this truly was new, then I suppose I could understand their angst. But the fact is, they have had 25 trustees' reports in 25 years and 23 of those have said Medicare is going to have an insolvent period. Yet they have never had a meeting of the trustees until this year, when they began to spin their ball of yarn about saving Medicare.

If the folks who want to give a tax cut to the rich believe older Americans will swallow the minnow that they are the ones who will save Medicare, after they have proposed big Medicare cuts in order to accommodate their tax cut for the wealthy, well, then, excuse me, but I guess I am somehow naive about the art of spending.

Perhaps they are much better, much more clever, much more artful than I ever believed possible at spinning a tale of complete, total, fiction.

It is time just to strip all of this aside and just strip the budget and all the other questions aside and ask ourselves in the sober light of day, as Americans—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans—what works in this country and what does not work.

What should we save and what should we get rid of? What should we fight for and what should we decide to scrap? If we do that, we will all conclude, it seems to me, not that we will try to follow the string of some constituency out there, but that we will aggressively put our nose to the grindstone here and work to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

We will aggressively decide to ask the American people, yes, to pay the current taxes in order to reduce the Federal budget deficit. Pay the taxes that now exist in the current tax law, and we will aggressively will protect those things that make this country a

better country, and make life in this country better for all Americans, especially those Americans who have gone before us in the work force, who have built this country, who survived the Depression, who fought the wars, who beat back the oppression of Hitler's nazism.

To those folks in this country who helped build and make this a great country, we are now saying to them, well, we are sorry, you will have to pay a little more for your health care. We will threaten Medicare because we want to give wealthy people a tax break. There is nothing wrong with being wealthy, but I am saying those priorities are out of whack.

I finish with one more point. I think the opportunity to do well, be successful, and make money is a terrific thing in this country. I wish everybody could achieve those things. But in my hometown, one person decides that he will commit his life to making as much money as he can and does so and is enormously successful as a business person. And there is another couple living on the other end of the street. He decides he will be a minister in a small rural church. Of course he does not get paid very much. So his wife teaches piano lessons to make ends meet, and they reach age 65 or 70. They have worked very hard their entire lives, but they do not have anything. No assets, no pension, no retirement system, no income.

I just ask the question, did they contribute less to their community? Did they contribute less, ministering in a rural church, giving piano lessons, helping children? Did they contribute less than the people who decided to, in every way every day, make as much money as they could?

No, both contributed to this country. That is why the things that make life better to people who contribute in that way, such as the Medicare Program, are important.

That is why we fight for them and why I am proud to say it is my party that created this program. I think it will be our party, by reaching out and joining hands with others, who will make sure this program is around for the long-term in this country's future. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair inform the Senator when he has 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAIG). The Senator will be notified.

VIOLENCE AGAINST GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Guy Pence is a Federal employee and a public servant in the true sense of the word. He is a forest ranger.

Mr. President, I became acquainted with Guy Pence about 3 or 4 years ago at this same time of the year when he took me on a pack trip into a place in Nevada called Table Mountain. It is a Forest Service wilderness area. There

may be places as nice, as beautiful, but no place is any more beautiful than Table Mountain.

It is an area with alpine meadows, beaver dams, eagles floating through the sky, deer, elk, all kinds of wildlife.

Mr. President, I came to Table Mountain as one person and left as another. I became more acquainted with a part of Nevada that I had only seen from the air. I became more acquainted with the problems of a Forest Service ranger, as to what should be done with grazing, what should be done with the infusion of elk into that area, what should be done in regard to mining operations, and the overuse and underuse of public lands. I learned a lot about that part of Nevada.

But I learned as much about Guy Pence and those other rangers who were with us on the street. Guy Pence is truly a fine man in any sense of the word, he is the father of three young girls and a volunteer who has a program where he acquaints the people in the Carson City, NV, area with wildlife and the wild generally.

The reason I mention Guy Pence's name this morning is because last Friday night, in the dark of the night, as Guy Pence was hundreds of miles away in the wilds of Nevada, leading another trip as he led me, a coward, or a number of cowards, in the middle of the night, came to his home and placed a bomb near his home. That bomb—I spoke to Guy Pence—was 10 to 12 feet away from his wife and three children. The bomb blew up, totaled his car, blew out the windows of his house. But for the fact that his wife and children were making pickles they would have all been either dead or injured severely, because less than a minute prior to the explosion, around 10 o'clock at night, the buzzer went off in the kitchen, the mother said the pickles were ready and the children and mother went into the kitchen. Within seconds the explosion took place.

In the dark of the night an unknown person or persons planted a bomb beneath his van as it sat about 10 feet away from his house, away from his wife and his children. I do not know who committed this crime or why it was committed. The facts are still being investigated.

But whether it was related to the controversial job that Guy Pence, forest ranger, has to do, or whether it was unrelated, the timing of this act could not have been more prominent. This bombing—by whomever perpetrated it—comes at a time when our Federal land managers are under assault. Not in name only, but actually under assault. This bombing comes at a time when extremists are destroying the very fabric of our democracy. We have only to look at Oklahoma City to appreciate the threat of this extremism.

The rule of law must apply to everyone. The alternative is anarchy. A red light at a corner is, at best, a useless decoration unless it is obeyed. There are those who think they are above or

beyond the law, that they represent a cause so just that it justifies any harm to others. Those who stray from law to violence are people too unsure of their cause to believe they can sway the Nation, the State, or a county, by any means other than force. There is no difference, moral or philosophical, between the Weathermen of the 1960's, the Symbionese Liberation Army of the 1970's, the Pan American bombing terrorists of the 1980's, or the Oklahoma City bombers of the 1990's.

There is no distinction, logical or analytical, between Lee Harvey Oswald, who killed President Kennedy, John Wilkes Booth, who killed President Lincoln, Sirhan Sirhan, who killed Senator Kennedy, Arthur Bremer who tried to assassinate George Wallace, and whoever planted the bomb in Carson City. All were anarchists. Each was a coward wishing to substitute the power of tooth and claw for the rule of law. They wish to abolish the ability of the Nation to govern its citizens and instead permit the citizenry to settle its own scores on the spot, without regard to right or justice or principle. A coward is someone who has not the decency to stand up for what he believes: The stab in the back, the bullet in the night, the bomb on a doorstep of a woman and children's home—that is the way of a coward. When you combine anarchy and cowardice, you get what happened in Carson City.

I grew up in a small town in southern Nevada, rural by any definition—no telephones, very few homes that had inside plumbing, no television. We were rural to the core. But the place where I was raised, people were friendly to one another. We depended on one another. Neighbors had a sense of community. That was part of our tradition.

But the West that I loved my entire life has been sullied. There is now a pattern of lawlessness that has raised its ugly head in the Western United States. For the sake of debate, let us set aside the case of Guy Pence, even though it is hard for me to do. We do not know whether it will ever be solved or even whether it is connected with the rising tide of anti-Government rhetoric which is placing families like those of Ranger Pence in terrible circumstances.

Let us address, instead, other instances that illustrate what I have called the ugly underbelly of a movement called County Supremacy.

I will be the first to acknowledge that there are a wide variety of views about how we should manage the lands owned by the people of this country, lands available for a multitude of uses: cross-country skiing, skiing, grazing cattle, mining, off-road vehicle adventure, hunting and fishing, camping and hiking.

The pressures in the rapidly growing West are enormous. I understand and appreciate the views of those who suggest that perhaps these lands should be turned over to the Western States. In Nevada, 87 percent of the land is owned

by the Federal Government. Some in our State feel that we need more. Some less. But I would also point out that the Federal Government has been flexible in meeting Nevada's needs.

Recently, I participated in a ceremony where we turned over to Boulder City, NV, more than 100,000 acres. Public land is now part of Boulder City. I introduced a bill that eventually gave Mesquite, NV, 4,400 new acres to develop their airport and a golf course. I was city attorney in Henderson, NV, now the third largest city in Nevada, when it got over 100,000 acres of Federal land.

So it is not as if there is not land being turned over to the private sector. But I do not agree with the wholesale turnover of some of the most scenic lands in our country, owned by all Americans. Land in Nevada that is public in nature is owned by people in Idaho, owned by people in Minnesota, owned by people in Nevada. I do not agree that these scenic lands should be turned over wholesale to what inevitably would turn out to be a sweetheart deal for developers, where only the most wealthy could own and lock up streams, valleys, mountains, meadows—the outdoors that we all cherish so much. I do not agree with the ultimate end advocated by the County Supremacist Movement and I am not afraid to say so.

I am not here to suggest that all those with strongly held views in the anti-Federal movement advocate violence. They do not. Over the weekend in Nevada a person who is a member of one of these groups—I believe there were probably others, but I read where there was one person, and I appreciate that—spoke out that she did not believe in violence after the bombing of Guy Pence's home and van.

Any movement must be concerned about the fringe elements within it—in this case, fringe elements who live a paranoid life of conspiracy, who threaten revolution, who threaten violence as a means to achieve their agenda.

Eric Hoffer said,

When cowardice is made respectable its followers are without number, both from among the weak and the strong. It easily becomes a fashion.

And it has.

Madam Chiang Kai-shek, who recently was here in the United States, said,

Every clique is a refuge for incompetence. It fosters disruption, disloyalty, it begets corruption and cowardice, and consequently it is a burden upon and a drawback to the progress of the country. Its instincts and actions are those of the pack.

And they are.

In the Western United States, Federal land managers have been threatened and attacked. In California, a Forest Service employee was shot at. In Oregon, a Bureau of Land Management employee was assaulted. In Nevada, the day the bomb severely damaged the office of the Forest Service, the Forest Service supervisor received a call saying he was next.

Two years ago, a Bureau of Land Management building in Reno, NV, was blown apart, the roof blown off, among other things. Gate and fee collection boxes have been booby-trapped with explosives in the West. Agency employees were told by a man that they could have his guns, he just wanted to pull the trigger one more time—at them.

In my county, a group of armed citizens stood by as a Forest Service employee helplessly tried to stop the illegal opening of a road with a bulldozer. A county official later said publicly that if the Forest Service officer had reached for his gun, 50 people would have shot him.

In Garfield County, MT, a group called The Free Men set up their own county government, declared the existing one illegal, and offered a cash bounty for the arrest of legitimate law enforcement officials.

In New Mexico, a Fish and Wildlife employee was told that he would have his head blown off. The manager of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in Oregon was threatened with death, and his family was harassed.

In the West, antigovernment activity has spread like a prairie fire. Property rights activists in Nevada, New Mexico, Montana, and Idaho regularly drown out Federal officials who speak at public meetings. Yet these same activists illegally graze cattle on Federal lands.

Worried Government agents such as Tom Dwyer, a U.S. Forest Service official, whose encounter with a property rights leader ignited a court battle, said, "There are times when I was driving back from being out of town when I wondered if my house would still be there."

Yes, Mr. President, Guy Pence wonders also.

Mr. President, this is not the America that we believe in. It is as if some sickness has swept our country, as if we are living in a different age, as if we have been transported in a time warp back to the barbarism and violence of previous civilizations like "Back to the Future," I guess.

I am here today to denounce violence and extremism in any form, whether it is clinic violence at an abortion office, or whether it is domestic violence in a home. It does not matter who committed an act against Guy Pence, it is violence, and we have to speak out against it.

Acts like this, and others which have been cited, have been legitimized by anti-Government rhetoric of those in positions of responsibility who should know better.

In my own State, elected officials have rejected the authority of Federal land managers to do their job on public lands—not land owned by the counties or the States, but land owned by all the people, including the urban residents of Reno and Las Vegas.

Mr. President, we must speak out. We must recognize that some Members of this body and in the other Chamber have all but advocated violence against

established law and order and sympathize and apologize for gun-threatening supremacists. There is legislation pending in both Houses of Congress that enshrines and advocates some of these principles.

One of the problems in our society today is that people are unwilling to speak out, are unwilling to speak out against violence, are unwilling to speak out against sexual depravity conveyed to our children through the mass media, and are unwilling to speak out against lawlessness, generally.

I am speaking out. I call upon my colleagues in this Chamber, the elected officials of the country and the Western United States, and the peaceful advocates of the county supremacist movement to decry violence. I would challenge the leaders of this movement to write their members, to speak out publicly, to let everyone know that while they may disagree with the policies of the Federal Government that they do not advocate violence.

We must get the message out that, while they may not like certain Federal policies, they do not advocate violence against innocent people whose job it is to enforce it.

Teddy Roosevelt said, "No man is above the law, and no man is below it." He also said, "Nor do we ask any man's permission when we require him to obey the law." We must obey the law.

Mr. President, I also would like to express publicly my appreciation to my friend from Minnesota for allowing me to go out of order.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me just say to my colleague from Nevada before he leaves that, after having heard his statement, it was really kind of my pleasure to defer to the Senator from Nevada. That was a very, very courageous, and powerful statement.

I would like to join him in condemning this extremism and violence. Murder is never legitimate. Attempted murder is never legitimate. There is no place for this in this country.

I think the Senator's statement is national in significance. I think what he said today on the floor of the Senate is needed to be said. There comes a point in time when silence is betrayal. And the Senator from Nevada clearly is not silent. I thank him for his courage. Mr. President, my understanding is I have 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes and 46 seconds.

MEDICARE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all let me ask unanimous consent that the editorial today in the Washington Post entitled "Cutting Medicare" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTTING MEDICARE

A new report suggests the congressional goal of cutting Medicare costs by a quarter

of a trillion dollars over the next seven years could be even harder to achieve than previously believed. The theory had been that large savings could be had if only the government would begin to manage Medicare the way the private sector has been managing its health care costs in recent years. The commonly cited evidence was that Medicare costs were rising much more rapidly than the health care costs of private employers, which were showing signs of being brought under control. The principal explanation was that Medicare remained essentially an old-style fee-for-service system while the private sector was turning more and more toward some form of managed care.

But the new study by Urban Institute researchers says that, properly accounted for, Medicare and private sector costs have been rising at pretty much the same speed in recent years. The suggestion is that there aren't large, painless savings available simply by shifting the system by which care is delivered. It's true, the study found, that in the past few years aggregate Medicare costs have been rising faster than the aggregate cost of private insurance. But a major reason has been that Medicare enrollment has been steadily rising—there are more older people in the society—while the number of privately insured has been declining.

If you look, however, at per capita costs for the same kinds of basic health care services, there's been little to choose between Medicare and private-sector growth rates, the study says. In the private sector there have been some one-time-only gains by virtue of shifts to managed care; the private sector is becoming a shrewder buyer of health care. But it isn't clear those gains can be sustained—and Medicare is already a better buyer of health care than the government's reputation might suggest. The government has used its buying power to force down what it pays providers, so that Medicare already pays hospitals less than the cost of treating many Medicare patients. In some respects, the private sector is catching up with cost-cutting steps that Medicare already has taken.

Just about everyone agrees that (a) there's a need to reduce the rate at which Medicare costs are rising, and (b) there's room for significant reform in the program. And, yes, a shift toward managed care can help. But there isn't a magic wand that can be waved to achieve large and lasting cost cuts painlessly. In the long run, if the government is going to pay appreciably less, the program is likely to provide less or the recipients will have to pay more.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, what the Urban Institute has come out with really should not surprise anyone who is a student of health care. And what the urban institute has said is that the kind of conventional wisdom in Medicare costs have been rising at a faster rate than private health insurance costs is simply not true once you look at the capital expenditure.

That is, a matter of fact, what is happening with Medicare which is, of course, part of the success of Medicare—that more and more people, thank God, live to be 65, and more and more people, thank God, live to be 80. That is really what you have to look at.

So it is not this sort of promise of shifting everything from fee for service to managed care and, therefore, reducing the costs, which needs to be questioned.